



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

displace or absorb the lower races of man. It is for those who deny this to show why and when this process will cease.

I believe that I have now shown that the principles of Mr. Darwin's *Origin of Species*, if applied to man with such modifications as are required by the great development and vast importance of his intellectual and moral rather than his mere animal nature, leads to the apparently paradoxical result that he is tending to become again as his progenitors once undoubtedly must have been, "a single homogeneous race."

ALFRED R. WALLACE.

## DR. MOORE AND HIS FIRST MAN.

### *To the Editor of the Anthropological Review.*

SIR,—When reading the remarkable article in No. XV of the *Anthropological Review*, "On the Application of the Principle of Natural Selection to Anthropology," my interest was peculiarly awakened by the hard blows which the writer therein took occasion to aim at myself and my book entitled *The First Man and his Place in Creation*. At once acknowledging that work to be immeasurably below the dignity and grandeur of the subject, I must, nevertheless, beg permission to expostulate with the author of this article on the severe treatment of me and my volume. My science and philosophy, alas! are not so advanced, but that I feel it painful to be misunderstood by him, more especially as the misunderstanding provokes him to express himself in a manner indicative of unphilosophical perturbation in his own spirit.

Dr. Hunt cannot be offended at my endeavour to defend the Christian idea of man's origin as that which, in my opinion, best accounts for the actual condition of mankind. This point of view may be deemed that of prejudice and presumption; but it is manifest that those who have been able to find their way to this point appear to comprehend the phenomena and ideas pertaining to man's mind and world quite as clearly as those who take other ground, and yet have not succeeded in accounting for man's existence and experience either scientifically or otherwise. In this respect, therefore, the Christian has an advantage; he assigns a sufficient cause for his existence and his hope, while those who do not believe as he does are still inquiring where they obtain no intelligence. Is not the fact that so many men of average thinking faculties have for ages believed the Christian

point of view to be most rational and satisfactory itself worthy of scientific consideration? This is an anthropological question. You at least will not blame me for striving to attain a stand-point whence best to discover the truths most important to man, and I will not blame him, if, proving my position to be wrong, he does his best to conduct me to the right one.

Dr. Hunt does not say my point of view is ill-chosen, but he classes me with those popular writers who "follow the reckless speculations of some of our teachers of science." Now, as true science cannot be compatible with reckless speculation, it is desirable to know what teachers of science he means. The most popular speculators of scientific character, at present in vogue, are, I believe, those who follow the teaching of Mr. Darwin and Professor Huxley, but he will not charge me with following them either very closely or very far. Had I not known better, my first impression might have been that he charged me with following certain teachers whose names are familiar in the *Anthropological Review*, since recklessness of speculation is supposed by many to be their most striking characteristic. It is important not to run into error on this matter. As, therefore, he intended to caution me and others, he would complete his kindness by informing us who are "our teachers of science," whose "reckless speculations" we are unfortunately following.

Dr. Hunt next observes that in my work on that interesting creature, *The First Man*, I write "with charming simplicity and modesty, 'How then was a Negro produced? We answer in a word by climate.'" Dr. Hunt writes ironically; by charming he probably signifies offensive; by simplicity, foolishness; and by modesty, impudence. As, however, I adduce the personal testimony of those who have observed the influence of climate and its concomitants in degrading the common African to the inferior condition of the Negro, may I not in all candour and courtesy assert that it is quite as charming, simple, and modest to attribute the Negro's inferiority to such external influences, as to his derivation by birth from some unknown species of black ape, which must have been wonderfully subject to external influences of some sort to produce a man at all, especially when we consider, that evidence to that effect is altogether wanting?

Dr. Hunt then gave me credit for stating a fact known to everybody, namely, that "man as he is has not yet been accounted for by philosophers." He does not, however, approve of my added suggestion, that anthropologists should endeavour to understand their own nature in particular, in order to prepare their minds for the study of "the science of man" in general. He deems it "deleterious to the cause of truth and science that such views should go forth to the

world unchallenged," and he rightly observes that men ought to learn the alphabet before they attempt to read. Precisely so; if any one would learn anything concerning man, either as a genus or a species, he should begin at the beginning, that is with himself, as Linnæus says *nosce teipsum*, because it is only as we are conscious of our own qualities that we can know what is human.

Lastly, Dr. Hunt announces that "no one can have read with greater feelings of indignation than myself, a charge which Dr. Moore has made more than once in his recent work, *The First Man and his place in Creation*, that Professor Huxley 'had undertaken his researches and assumed his character of seer and prophet on the ground of prejudice against Christianity.'" Now, it is not correct to say I either bring a charge against Professor Huxley or impute motives to him in this or any other passage. I merely express a fear founded as I show on these, his own words—"Thoughtful men, once escaped from the blinding influences of traditional prejudice, will find in the lowly stock whence man has sprung, the best evidence of the splendour of his capacities, and will discern, in his long progress through the past, a reasonable ground in his attainment of a nobler future." In these words Professor Huxley clearly asserts his power of surveying the past of man and of foreseeing man's future. That is to say, he thinks it a more reasonable ground of faith to rely on his own ability to discern a past nowhere revealed, and a future nowhere foretold, than to entertain the faith of Christians who, according to "the blinding influences of traditional prejudice," associate the beginning of man with his end, and believe in a direct genealogical connection between the second Adam, the Lord from Heaven, and the first Adam, of the earth earthy, but without any intermediate paternity between him and his Maker. As Christianity is professedly founded on a record of the past and a promise of a nobler future, does not the whole evidence on which Christian faith rests properly belong to the science of Anthropology? Certainly Christianity offers the key of knowledge to all, and repudiates no true science, but while excluding superstition and pretension declares the right of all men to acquire all the truth they can. If then I find Professor Huxley founding his faith only upon his own retrospective and prospective discernment of "Man's Place in Nature," as expounded by himself, am I not justified in expressing a fear lest, while he attributes my faith to the "blinding influences of traditional prejudice," he grounds his own faith on a prejudice in favour of a theory that excludes Christianity? If in the expression of this fear I have wronged Professor Huxley, I most sincerely beg his pardon, and assure him that no one can possibly feel higher respect for him as a profound and most thorough anatomist

than myself. But I am sure that if I believed he taught a dogma that is not true, and, therefore, is dangerous, he would not think me honest if I did not say so, when the occasion properly presented itself. Why he, or any one else, should be more indignant at my expression of a fear as before said, than at Dr. Hunt's affirming, as he does, "his reasoning incorrect" and "his assertions dogmatic," I cannot conceive. Professor Huxley may deem my views dreamy, as I deem his, and that without indignation on either side. I honour him as a gentleman of extraordinary scientific acquirements, and I would honour all men because they are men, but especially those who are entrusted with vast endowments, such as Mr. Darwin, Sir Charles Lyell and Professors Huxley and Owen; that, however, is no reason why I should not the more deplore anything which appeared to me wrong in their teaching, and freely say why to the best of my ability.

Dr. Hunt directly applied the terms reckless, contemptible, deleterious, ungenerous, base, and he has implied offensive foolishness and impudence in relation to my opinions. I do not complain of such terms because they injure me, but because he feels justified in employing them, while I cannot help thinking them quite uncalled for and utterly unphilosophical on the occasion, since they serve no purpose but to show how heartily he abominates my ideas.

Suffer me to add an expression of regret that the reviewer of my book in the *Popular Magazine of Anthropology* (Oct. 1866) suffered from *melancholy* in consequence of reading it; I regret the event the more, since the *black bile* to which the malady is ascribed, seems to have disturbed his discerning functions. He condemns the strong language I apply to Büchner's logic, and I fear it is blamable, but yet I would say that if he adopts the reasoning in "*Force and Matter*," as the exponent of his own views, he will still be unable to explain the existence of his own reason, his will, and his consciousness of personal self-hood. The pity and indignation he expresses towards me as a "malicious, incoherent, scribbler," whose writings are fit only for the entertainment of "elderly *females of both sexes* and Sunday-school children," must pass for what they are worth in comparison with his very positive science for the useful results of which the world waits. As the verdant freshness of his style indicates mental vigour, it is somewhat surprising that he perceives no difference of meaning between being *anatomic* and being an *anatomist*. We speak of anatomic specimens but not of anatomic men. If he thinks that he himself can be made into an anatomic specimen, as his body or any part of it can be, I can only say *that* is not my idea of him. With regard to my anatomy, though my life is not devoted to that science, I have studied it with the best anatomists in Europe, and, while from youth to age I have

watched the progress of science and the vagaries that falsely go under its name, I have retained enough anatomy to understand what Professors Huxley and Owen have so admirably written, but have failed to learn that the nature of a man is to be discovered by anatomising his body.

I thank my reviewer for his corrections; and, though his own article shows how easily he overlooks his own mistakes, I should be glad of his keen eye for errors when revising the press for a new edition of *The First Man*, to be improved by a review of reviewers, whose *animus* may usefully serve as a warning to that nobler class of readers, curiously designated by my reviewer, "elderly females of both sexes, and Sunday-school children."

GEO. MOORE.

[Dr. Moore, in the foregoing letter, makes the remark: "Now it is not correct to say I either bring a charge against Professor Huxley or impute motives to him in this or any other passage." Dr. Moore, in his work, says, Professor Huxley undertook "his researches and assumed his character of seer and prophet on the ground of prejudice against Christianity." This, he now tells us, does not convey a charge or impute a motive! We think it would have been well had Dr. Moore remained silent and not again called attention to a book which ought to be buried in oblivion as soon as possible. When we look through Dr. Moore's book we feel very much inclined to apply far stronger terms to it than any employed in the article complained of. Who, for instance, can read without a feeling of indignation such passages as the following?—"So we believe that Vogt, like some others, has *perverted science* under the blinding influence of prejudice, arising from *ignorance* of Christianity," preface, p. xv. "Hence a kind of smaller philosophers are now prevalent, who think they believe as they teach, that man was verily, in some remote era, in the immeasurable ages, gradually raised in character and style of mind by the pressure of circumstances and natural selection, under which a first-class pair of apes begat the lowest possible pair of approximate human beings," p. xix. "The theory of man's origin and self-elevation now advocated by certain lecturers on science, who exclude especial revelation, and endeavour to supplant or supplement the pulpit by their platform on Sunday evenings, will probably convince themselves and many of their audience that the babel language of their science is that of true inspiration . . . but it is *profane impertinence* to obtrude their clashing 'ologies' upon us on the day appointed to hear what He who died and rose from the dead for us would say to us," p. xxv. The foregoing passages all occur in the preface, but

throughout the whole volume the same narrow-minded spirit prevails. Our facetious contemporary, the *Popular Magazine of Anthropology*, has, we understand, given up the ghost (at least for a time) on hearing that the public generally, and Dr. Moore in particular, could not understand how there could be "elderly females of both sexes." Our contemporary will, we understand, appear again when the popular mind is prepared to accept this profound and suggestive truth. If Dr. Moore will take the trouble to read this article again, he will find that the quotation he has made from it of "malicious, incoherent scribbler," nowhere occurs there. The word "malicious" is not to be found in the article, nor any word of similar import.—EDITOR.]

---

## ON THE DOCTRINE OF CONTINUITY APPLIED TO ANTHROPOLOGY.\*

By JAMES HUNT, Esq., Ph.D., F.S.A., F.R.S.L., F.A.S.L., etc.

---

THE great German philosopher, Emanuel Kant, in his work on *Anthropologie*, points out the fact that it is somewhat hazardous to publish any assertion opposed to the general opinion, and that man generally is loth to utter opinions in which few persons will agree with him. Human nature has, I fear, not greatly changed since the time of Kant. I must confess to a great sympathy with those people who like to utter sentiments in unison with those whom they address: but on the present occasion I am entirely in ignorance of what may be the sentiments of my audience on the subject to which I have undertaken to call attention. If, therefore, I express sentiments in which I shall find few or no supporters, you must please remember that I do so in entire ignorance of what you would like me to say on this subject. I do not promise that if I did know what you would like me to say, I would do it.

A celebrated anthropologist of the last century, Charles White, said that he published his work "under the idea that whatever tends to elucidate the nature, constitution, and history of the human race, must be interesting to man; and whatever tends to display the wisdom, order, and harmony of the creation, and to evince the necessity of recurring to a Deity as a first cause, must be agreeable to man."† I think few will doubt that the subject I have chosen is in-

\* Extracts from a paper read before the Hastings and St. Leonards Philosophical Society, on December 12, 1866.

† *On the Regular Gradation of Man and Animals*, 1795, p. 138.